

### **REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-3 are now present in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Han, U.S. Patent No. 6,489,957. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite "the new object being different from a combination of the selected one or more existing objects." Support for the above recitation can be found in FIGs. 3, 4 and 6 as originally filed. Applicant respectfully submits that the above recitation as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

In particular, Han in FIG. 2 discloses generating a solid part 200A or 200B by using a Boolean combination of the solid shapes 201 and 202. In other words, the new solid part is a Boolean combination of the selected solid shapes. Unlike Han, the present invention simply uses the existing objects as references to generate a new object different from the combination of the selected one or more existing objects. For example, as embodied in FIG. 3 of the present application, the new object 30 (between the existing objects 10 and 20) is generated by using the existing objects 10 and 20 as references, but is different from the combination of the selected

existing objects 10 and 20. Therefore, Han fails to teach "the new object being different from a combination of the selected one or more existing objects" as recited in amended claim 1.

Since Han fails to teach each and every limitation of amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of Han. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$60.00 is attached herewith.

Application No. 10/736,758  
Amendment due April 23, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of December 23, 2005

Docket No.: 2450-0606P

Page 5 of 5

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant